

**Community Engagement Task Force Meeting**  
**Tuesday, January 30, 2017**  
**6pm-8:30pm**

*Task Force Members:* Brad Johnson, Damon Circosta, George Chapman, Joyce Fitzpatrick, Carole Meyre, Tom Oxholm, Amy Fulk, Courtney Crowder, Joyce Fitzpatrick,

- I. **Welcome-** Damon Circosta, Task Force Chair, opened and welcomed everyone to the meeting.
- II. **Introduction of Meeting-** Chris Aycock, facilitator, briefly reviewed the meeting agenda.
- III. **Development Community Presentation-** Mack Paul, Morningstar Law Group, shared insight into the development side of rezoning cases and the citizen engagement process.
  - a. What are the pros of the current system?
    - i. Developers have to notifying neighbors within 100 feet of the proposed project before the rezoning application is submitted to the City. Some HOA's & neighborhood associations are very engaged and attend the neighborhood meetings. This helps developers identify any opposition and address concerns before the application is submitted.
    - ii. Having the public hearing at the end of the process is helpful because it allows the developer to communicate and work with the community.
  - b. What are the cons of the current system?
    - i. Having the CAC membership vote on a zoning case is not always productive. Some CAC boundaries are very large and people voting may not live in the area being affected by the project.
  - c. Suggested changes to the public engagement process:
    - i. Broadening the neighborhood notice of the proposed project to extend past the 100 feet may be helpful.
  - d. Questions/ Comments:
    - i. Questions were raised regarding the day, time and who is required to attend the neighborhood meetings. The day and times for the neighborhood meetings are held at the discretion of the developer. City staff does not attend the neighborhood meetings.
    - ii. There was discussion on CAC size and its impact on the rezoning process and the number of cases each particular CAC hears annually.
- IV. **Planning Commission Presentation-** Steve Schuster, Planning Commission member and architect, presented on his personal experience with the public engagement process.
  - a. What are the pros of the current system?
    - i. Having residents engaged in the zoning process is essential and the CACs allow for additional community dialogue. The Planning Commission takes into account the CAC vote and will not move forward with a case if there was no CAC vote.
  - b. What are the cons of the current system?
    - i. There is no consistency in how each CAC operates; which can be problematic. Some CAC leaders have a stronger voice & influence within their CAC which may influence the views of the group.
  - c. Suggested changes to the public engagement process:
    - i. There needs to be consistent policies, procedures, timing, and schedules across all the CACs.

- ii. More public education on the rezoning process is needed so citizens understand what their input really means. Furthermore, public engagement on capital improvement projects is important. This allows citizens to become a part of the process and offer input which can help staff address some tough decisions.

d. *Questions/ Comments:*

- i. Some examples of CAC inconsistencies were further explained.
- ii. Questions were raised regarding the timing of the Planning Commission meetings and how they interpret CAC votes.

V. **RCAC Presentation-** Donna Bailey, Wade CAC Co-chair, presented the RCAC's rezoning process recommendations. The proposal encourages developers to share project plans with CACs early in the process and begin dialogue to address conditions before it goes before the Planning Commission.

a. What are the pros of the current system?

- i. There is a commitment from all CACs to hold a special meeting if there is a pending rezoning case that needs to go before the planning commission.

b. What are the cons of the current system?

- i. The CAC is not included in the very beginning of the process.
- ii. The CAC schedule and rezoning process do not align which causes frustration with developers and CAC leadership.

c. Suggested changes to the public engagement process:

- i. It is requested the neighborhood meeting radius be increased to 1,000 feet.
  - 1. CAC leadership, HOA's and neighborhood associations should be invited to the initial neighborhood meeting.
  - 2. The notice should go out 14 days in advance.
- ii. During the second CAC meeting with the developer the RCAC would like to have the staff report before the CAC takes a vote.

d. *Questions/ Comments:*

- i. The RCAC proposal has been shared with City Council, Planning staff and others in the development community.

VI. **Planning Department Presentation-** Ken Bowers, Planning Director, gave a presentation on the CAC's role in the rezoning process. CACs have not been codified as a part of the official rezoning process. The CACs are seen as one of many venues for public input and participation.

a. What's working well:

- i. CAC meetings are held closer to home and at a more convenient time.
- ii. There is more opportunity for citizens to ask the developer direct questions.
- iii. The CAC meeting is inserted in the beginning of the process and this helps with addressing concerns.

b. What's not working well:

- i. The role of the CAC lacks clarity (how much weight does the CAC vote hold as an advisory body).
- ii. The CAC vote is not done in secret which can lead to peer pressure.
- iii. There is no fixed membership and the boundaries are larger than the typical impact area.

c. Suggestions for Improvement:

- i. CACs can be used as a venue for education and empowerment. Staff can work on educating residents about the rezoning process.

- ii. CACs can become mandatory and codified as a part of the rezoning process. This would mean there needs to be governance reforms and electronic polling. This model works better with smaller CAC boundaries.
- iii. CACs can be removed from the rezoning process. The neighborhood meeting would need to encompass a larger radius of 500 to 1,000 feet. Change the Planning Commission meetings to an evening time slot.

*d. Questions/ Comments:*

- i. Questions were raised about what goes into a staff report and what City Council receives from the Planning Commission. The staff report describes the case, highlights any adverse impacts that are not easily mitigated and notes if the case consistent with the UDO. Once the staff report and any additions are approved by the Commission, it then become a Planning Commission document and sent to City Council.
- ii. Wade CAC's secret ballot voting method was mentioned. Comments will be submitted electronically.

VII. **Discussion on Public Engagement-** Task force members further discussed the information shared on the rezoning process and what that means for CACs. Members made suggestions on the best way to move forward with creating a citizen engagement model. There was a consensus that the group needed to address the big picture of the CACs and their roles in engagement.

VIII. **Planning Next Meeting-** Members will review presented information and come to the next meeting with ideas surrounding a process, structure, governance, duties, communications, ect. The next meeting will be an open free flowing discussion on what recommendations will be made to Council.

IX. **Adjourn**

Next Meeting: Monday, February 6<sup>th</sup> from 6pm-8:30pm.